

NEW SPECIES, VARIETIES AND COMBINATIONS FROM THE HERBARIUM AND THE COLLECTIONS OF THE ARNOLD ARBORETUM¹

ALFRED REHDER

Neillia hypomalaca, sp. nov.

Frutex gracilis metralis; ramuli leviter flexuosi, hornotini fulvo-hirsuto-villosi, leviter angulati, annotini rubro-fusci. Folii lamina ambitu triangulari-ovata, 3–4.5 cm. longa et 2.5–3 cm. lata, basi subcordata vel rotundata, inciso-lobulata utrinque lobulis 3–4 acutis serratis infimo 5–8 mm. longo, in caudam dimidiam laminam aequantem serratam attenuata, supra densiuscule vel sparsius accumbenti-pilosa, subtus molliter et satis dense accumbenti-pilosa et ad costam venasque dense patentim pilosa, nervis utrinque 4–5; petiolus 3–4 mm. longus, dense fulvo-hirsuto-villosus; stipulae oblongae, 5–6 mm. longae, fere glabrae. Racemi 3–4 cm. longi, 8–14-flori floribus roseis; rhachis ut pedunculus circ. 1 cm. longus dense pilosa; bracteae caducae, glabrescentes, pedicellum subaequantes; pedicelli 3–4 mm. longi, villosi-pilosi et sparse glandulosi; calycis tubus cylindricus 8–9 mm. longus, extus basin versus sparse glandulis breviter stipitatis et pilis sparsissime conspersus vel fere omnino glaber, intus laxe villosulus, lobi lanceolati, 5 mm. longi, longe mucronato-acuminati; petala rotundato-ovati, sepalis paullo breviora, ciliolata; stamina 15–20; ovarium unicum vel raro duo, glabrum, 4 mm. longum, in stylum basi sparse et longe pilosum attenuatum; ovula 4–5.

CHINA. Yunnan: Litiping range, Mekong-Yangtze divide, east of Weihsi, *J. F. Rock*, no. 9171, in 1923, shrub 3 ft., flowers pink (type); brousse des collines à Tong-tchouan, alt. 2550 m., *E. E. Maire* (Arnold Arb. distr. no. 429) May [1910–14?] “arbuste delicat, buissonnant; fl. couleur chair”; halliers des montagnes à Ou-long, alt. 2250 m., *E. E. Maire* (Arnold Arb. distr. no. 529) May [1910–14 ?], “arbuste delicat, peu rameux, fl. couleur chair”; haies et halliers des collines, alt. 2500 m., *E. E. Maire* (Arnold Arb. distr. no. 41), April [1910–14 ?] “arbuste delicat, buissonnant, fl. couleur chair”; in shady thickets on the Li-ti-ping, lat. 27° 12' N, alt. 10000 ft., *G. Forrest*, no. 13883, June 1917 (shrub 3–4 ft.; flowers rose and white).

This species is apparently closely related to *N. sinensis* Oliver and to *N. villosa* W. W. Sm.; from the former it is easily distin-

¹ Continued from vol. XII. 78.

guished by the densely pubescent branches, rhachis and petioles, by the smaller subcordate and more deeply lobed leaves densely pubescent beneath and less so above and the shorter pedicels; from *N. villosa* it differs chiefly in the much smaller leaves, shorter petioles, narrower stipules, the presence of petals and the glabrous ovary. From *N. thibetica* Franch. which also has pubescent leaves, it differs chiefly in its spreading and pilose, not velutinous pubescence, more deeply lobed smaller leaves, shorter petioles, the calyx-tube not silky outside and in the glabrous ovary.

***Securinega suffruticosa* (Pall.) comb. nov.**

Chenopodium ? suffruticosum Pallas, Reise Russ. Reich. III. pt. 1, p. 424 (1776), nomen.

Pharnaceum ? suffruticosum Pallas, op. cit. III. pt. 2, p. 716, t. E, fig. 2 (1776).

Xylophylla ramiflora Aiton, Hort. Kew. I. 376 (1789).

Osyris alba Georgi, Besch. Russ. Reich. III. 1341 (1800); non Linnaeus (ex Ledebour, Fl. Ross. III. 583).

Phyllanthus ramiflorus Persoon, Syn. Pl. II. 591 (1807).

Geblera suffruticosa Fischer & Meyer in Index Sem. Hort. Petrop. I. 28 (1835).—Ledebour, Fl. Ross. III. 583 (1851).

Flüggea suffruticosa Baillon, Étud. Gén. Euphorb. 592 (1858).

Phyllanthus fluggeoides Mueller Arg. in Linnaea, XXXII. 16 (1863).

Phyllanthus japonicus Mueller Arg. in Linnaea, XXXII. 52 (1863), in part.

Securinega ramiflora Mueller Arg. in De Candolle, Prodr. XV. pt. I. 449 (1866).—Rehder in Jour. Arnold Arb. VII. 191 (1926); VIII. 152 (1927).

Securinega fluggeoides Mueller Arg. in De Candolle, Prodr. XV. pt. I. 450 (1866).

Securinega japonica Miquel in Ann. Mus. Bot. Lugd.-Bat. III. 128 (Prol. Fl. Jap. 292) (1867), in part.

Some time ago Mr. H. C. Skeels drew my attention to the fact that *Securinega ramiflora* (Ait.) Muell. Arg. had an older specific epithet, namely “suffruticosa” going back to *Pharnaceum ? suffruticosum* Pall. of 1776. Fischer and Meyer based the type of their new monotypic genus *Geblera* on *Pharnaceum ? suffruticosum*, of which Pallas gives not only a fairly accurate, though incomplete description but also a figure of a flowering branch; this figure with the description, taking into consideration the region where the plant was collected, shows clearly that the plant described by Pallas is identical with *Securinega ramiflora*.

I am unable to find specific differences between *S. ramiflora* and *S. fluggeoides*, as I have already stated in this Journal (VII. 191 and VIII. 152); all the differences given are variable and do not hold in the numerous specimens before me. Also *Securinega japonica* Miquel, at least partly, belongs here, excluding the name bringing synonym, the specific epithet having been taken from *Hemicicca japonica* Baill. which is a synonym of *Phyllanthus flexuosus* (Sieb. & Zucc.) Muell. Arg.

Vitis Wilsonae Veitch apud Gard. Chron. ser. 3, XLVI. 236, fig. 101 (1909), nomen seminud.—Rehder in Sargent, Pl. Wilson. III. 428 (1917), pro synonym. *V. reticulatae* Gagnep.

Vitis reticulata Pampanini in Nuov. Giorn. Bot. Ital. XVII. 429, fig. 13 (1910).—Rehder, Man. Cult. Trees Shrubs, 603 (1927).—Non *V. reticulata* (Thwaites) M. A. Lawson.

Vitis reticulata Gagnepain in Lecomte, Not. Syst. II. 12 (1911); in Sargent, Pl. Wilson. I. 103 (1911).—Non *V. reticulata* (Thwaites) M. A. Lawson.

This species was described at approximately the same time independently under the same name by Pampanini and by Gagnepain, but based in each case on different specimens; by Pampanini on Silvestri, no. 1438 and by Gagnepain on Farges, nos. 539 and 124 and on Wilson, Veitch. Exp. no. 1151. Both authors overlooked or disregarded the older homonym *Vitis reticulata* M. A. Lawson which they probably considered as based on the invalid name *Cissus reticulata* Thwaites, changed by Planchon to *Cissus retivenia* on account of the earlier *C. reticulata* Bl., which was cited by Miquel (in Ann. Mus. Bot. Lugd.-Bat. I. 81. 1863) only as a synonym of *Vitis geniculata* (Bl.) Miq. and did not become a valid name until Planchon published a description in 1887. There exists, however, a still earlier name, *C. reticulata* Willd. apud Roemer & Schultes, Syst. III. Mant. 248 (1827), which was referred to *Cissus canescens* Lam. by Kunth. *Vitis Wilsonae*, the earliest name given to this species, was not taken up, as it was considered a nomen nudum or seminudum having been published with an insufficient description and a figure of a leaf. It was identified with *V. reticulata* Gagnepain in 1917 and is now the only available name for this species.

Acanthopanax stenophyllum Harms f. **dilatatus**, f. nov.

A typo recedit foliolis semper 3 (in specimine viso tandem) oblongo-oblancoatis vel oblongo-obovatis petiolulo brevi incluso 6–11 cm. longis et 2–3.5 cm. latis.—Frutex inermis, glaber, ramulis brunneis levibus.

CHINA. Shansi: Yuan-ch'ii distr., Shui-wang-ping, in silva subalpina, alt. 1900 m., *Harry Smith*, no. 6563, July 21, 1924.

This plant is apparently an extremely broad-leaved form of *A. stenophyllum*, though at first glance it looks very distinct on account of its much broader leaflets, and particularly if compared with the other extreme of the species, *A. stenophyllum* f. *angustissimus* Rehd. (in Jour. Arnold Arb. IX. 99. 1928) with leaflets only 3–5 mm. wide. It seems hardly possible that these two extreme forms could belong to one species but I can find no other character to distinguish it from *A. stenophyllum*. From *A. Wilsonii* Harms, with which this form also may be compared, it differs in its much larger and thinner leaflets, the middle one distinctly stalked and in longer pedicels.

Campsis Tagliabuana (Vis.), comb. nov. (= *C. chinensis* × *radicans*).

Tecoma Tagliabuana Visiani in Atti Istit. Venet. Sci. ser. 3, iv. 135 (1859).—Meunissier in Rev. Hort. 1928, p. 310, tab.

Tecoma hybrida hort. ex Dippel Handb. Laubholz. i. 48 (1889), pro syn. *T. grandiflorae*.—Jouin in Jardin, xiii. 104, tab. (1899); Garden lv. 315 (1899).—Rehder in Sargent, Trees & Shrubs, i. 93, t. 47 (1903).

Campsis hybrida Zabel in Ruempler, Gartenb.-Lex. 166 (1901).—Rehder in Bailey, Stand. Cycl. Hort. ii. 652 (1914); Man. Trees Shrubs, 790 (1927).

Tecoma intermedia Schelle in Beissner, Schelle & Zabel, Handb. Laubholz-Ben. 435 (1903).

It seems strange that Visiani's name *Tecoma Tagliabuana* which was published with a full Latin description and the definite statement that it is a hybrid between *T. radicans* and *T. grandiflora*, has been completely overlooked by all the later authors and no mention of this name is found in botanical or horticultural literature, until Meunissier resuscitated it in an article in Revue Horticole in which he gave complete data and a colored plate of this hybrid. According to Visiani the hybrid was raised by the brothers Tagliabue apparently some time before 1859, but it does not seem to have been distributed under Visiani's name. The hybrid, however, has appeared in gardens under various other names. The first references I find are those given in 1872 by K. Koch (Dendrol. ii. 308) as *T. Princei coccinea grandiflora* and in 1877 by Lavallé (Arb. Segrez. 176) as *T. radicans coccinea grandiflora*.

It is also probable that *T. radicans atropurpurea* mentioned in 1865 by Jaeger (Ziergehölze, 134) represents this hybrid; at least specimens I have seen under the name *T. atropurpurea* and *T. grandiflora atropurpurea* belong to it. Also the following names are referable to forms of this hybrid: *Tecoma grandiflora aurantia* and *T. grandiflora Princei* (Dippel, Handb. Laubholz. i. 48. 1889); *T. chinensis aurantiaca* (Koehne, Dendr. 522. 1893); *Campsis radicans* f. *atropurpurea* Voss, *C. chinensis* f. *aurantiaca* Voss and f. *Princei* Voss (Siebert & Voss, Vilmorin's Blumengärt. i. 801. 1894); *T. radicans Princei*, *T. grandiflora rubra* Hort. Sahut and *T. grandiflora Madame Galen* Hort. Sahut (Nicholson & Mottet, Dict. Hort. Prat. v. 208, 209. 1898); *T. radicans grandiflora atropurpurea* and *T. Princei coccinea grandiflora* (Jouin in Jardin, xiii. 104. 1899); the same specific and varietal names may appear in horticultural literature or in catalogues under *Bignonia* or under *Campsis* instead of *Tecoma*.

Lasianthus Labordei (Lévl.), comb. nov.

Canthium Labordei Lévillé in Fedde, Rep. Spec. Nov. xiii. 178 (1914); Fl. Kouy-Tchéou, 364 (1915).

CHINA. K w e i c h o u: district de Tsin-gay, mont de Kao tchay,

penchant escarpe des montagnes, *J. Laborde & E. Bodinier*, no. 2109, March 7, 1898 (holotype of *Canthium Labordei* in Herb. Edinb.; photo. in Herb. Arnold Arb.); Si-mi-yao, Pa-na, Cheng-feng hsien, *Y. Tsiang*, no. 4423, Oct. 25, 1930 (low shrub in dense shade); foot of Van-ching-shan, Kiang-kow, alt. 450 m., *Y. Tsiang*, no. 7487, Dec. 8, 1930 (small tree in light wood); foot of Van-ching-shan, Yin-kiang, alt. 500 m., *Y. Tsiang*, no. 7591, Dec. 12, 1930 (low shrub, 0.30 m.); border of Ksi, Tan-ling, Tuh-shan, S. Kweichou, alt. 500 m., *Y. Tsiang*, nos. 6951 and 6956, Sept. 7, 1930 (shrub, 1 m., in dense shade).

This specimen described by L  veill   as a *Canthium*, a genus referred by K. Schumann as a section to *Plectronia*, does not belong to that genus, as the usually 4-seeded fruit and the style divided at the apex into 4 linear stigmas clearly show. It apparently is referable to *Lasianthus* and seems most closely related to *L. longicauda* Hook. f., from which it differs chiefly in its much narrower leaves 5–14 cm. long and usually 8–16 mm. broad, with less prominent veins and obsolete veinlets and in the glabrous or nearly glabrous pedicels; the whole plant is generally quite glabrous, only on no. 6956 a slight pubescence is noticeable on the tips of the branchlets, the upper petioles and on the very young calyces. No. 7487 differs in its somewhat broader leaves being about 7 cm. long and 1.8 cm. broad, while no. 7591 differs in the leaves being rounded at the base and borne on very short petioles about 1 mm. long.

Of *Lasianthus longicauda* Hook. f. I have seen no Indian material, but two Yunnan specimens (Henry nos. 9035 and 10633) determined by Hutchinson and one Yunnan specimen collected by Delavay at Long-ki and determined by Pitard as *L. japonicus* Miq. which doubtless belongs to *L. longicauda* and not to *L. japonica* Miq. from which it differs in the quite glabrous more caudate leaves, the nearly glabrous branchlets, less pubescent calyx and in the corolla-lobes being glabrous inside except at the base, while in *L. japonica* according to Yatabe's figure (Iconog. Fl. Jap. i. t. 28) the corolla-lobes are densely villous inside to their very tips.

(To be continued)

HERBARIUM, ARNOLD ARBORETUM
HARVARD UNIVERSITY